



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

War vielleicht ein bischen böse
Auf den Liebsten, liess ihn köpfen ;
Aber als sie auf der Schüssel
Das geliebte Haupt erblickte,

Weinte sie und ward verrückt,
Und sie starb in Liebeswahnsinn—
(Liebeswahnsinn ! Pleonasmus !
Liebe ist ja schon ein Wahnsinn !)

Nächtlich auferstehend trägt sie,
Wie gesagt, das blutige Haupt
In der Hand, auf ihrer Jagdfahrt—
Doch mit toller Weiberlaune

Schleudert sie das Haupt zuweilen
Durch die Lüfte, kindisch lachend,
Und sie fängt es sehr behende
Wieder auf, wie einen Spielball.

According to Heine, the woman enamoured of John is not Salome but Herodias. The perverted and disgusting *Liebeswahnsinn* of this Herodias is reproduced in its exact details and ascribed to the daughter in Wilde's *Salome*, but it finds no place in *Johannes*. We have been accustomed to look upon these two women as equally guilty of the death of the prophet, and it is no more strange that the deeds of the one, should, by conscious poetic license (in Sudermann's *Johannes*, both women try to seduce John), be ascribed to the other, than that their names and subsequent history should be confused by Josephus (*Ant.* lib. 18. cap. 7), Nicephorus (*Hist. eccles.* lib. 1. cap. 20), and Metaphrastes (*Vita Sanctorum*).

This love element, introduced into the story is probably entirely of nineteenth century romantic origin. The editors and commentators of Heine, even if they have attempted it, have not yet given the form and source of the popular legend which he quotes. It does not seem to have existed in the older authorities on the legends of the martyrs and saints. I have searched for it in vain in the Apocryphal Gospels and Epistles, in Josephus, in the writings of the Ante-Nicene, Nicene, and Post-Nicene Fathers, in Tillemont's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* (1706), in the *Acta Sanctorum*, and in Baring-Gould's *Lives of the Saints*. The only passage of which Heine's

"Und sie fängt es sehr behende
Wieder auf, wie einen Spielball."

is a reminiscence, is where Eusebius Emesenus speaks of Salome playing with the head of John

the Baptist as with an apple. (*Καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ δέδωκα τῷ κορασίῳ ἐπὶ πίνακι, καὶ ὡς μῆλῳ προσέειπεν. Oratio de adventu et Annuntiatione Joannis apud inferos.*)

In view of the well-known fertility and perversity of Heine's imagination, it is likely that he invented the *Sage* pure and simple and assigned a fictitious source. There is all the more ground for this belief by reason of the fact that Heine did exactly this thing in at least one other notable instance. The solution of the problem of the Flying Dutchman's release from his curse is in Wagner's drama taken bodily from Heine's *Aus den Memoiren des Herren von Schnabelewopski*, VII. Wagner acknowledged this indebtedness as quoted by Elster, *Heines Werke*, Bd. iv, S. 9. In the same place Elster gives the results of investigations which proved that the sources assigned by Heine for this solution were entirely fictitious.

JACOB N. BEAM.

Princeton, N. J.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

Orígenes de la Novela. Tomo I. *Introducción. Tratado histórico sobre la primitiva novela española*, por D. M. MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO de la Real Academia Española. Madrid : Bailly-Bailliére é Hijos, 1905. 8vo, dxxxiv pp.

I.

It is no exaggeration to say that this volume is one of the most remarkable contributions made in our time to the history of Spanish literature. Señor Menéndez y Pelayo's qualifications are incontestable ; he is versed in many other literatures besides that of his own country, and has thus acquired the means of applying the comparative test ; he seems to have read almost everything, and to have forgotten next to nothing ; he covers immense tracts of difficult ground with enviable sagacity and surefootedness ; and his diverse learning enables him to illuminate every aspect of his subject with ingenious and suggestive parallels. Probably he alone is competent to criticize his own work effectively. I must be content to give a general idea of its scope and value, and even this is no easy task.

After defining the relation of the Greek and Latin romances to the Spanish novel, the author at once enters upon his main theme by tracing the transmission of the Oriental apologue to the Spanish Arabs and Jews, its circulation in Spain, and its diffusion throughout Western Europe. This is a singularly useful piece of work, and it has the further merit of being the first adequate presentation of a literary development which has hitherto been obscured by fantastic theories. For the first time we are on solid ground. Unlike Royer-Collard, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo does not "disdain a fact"; he abounds in clear and definite details, and, though the inclusion of every additional fact increases the probabilities of error, his accuracy is rarely at fault. He indicates the subterranean course of *Kalilah and Dimnah* from the immemorial East to mediæval Spain; he follows the broadening European stream from the age of philosophic mystics like Ramón Lull and warrior-statesmen like Juan Manuel to the humaner, more ironic days of La Fontaine; and he vitalizes the dry bibliographical minutiae which form the basis of the exposition. Equally interesting are the analysis of *Barlaam and Josaphat*,¹ and the spirited description of the astonishing adventures and transformations undergone by a romance which was destined to stimulate the genius of men so far apart in temperament and time as Judah ben

¹ The Græco-Christian form of *Barlaam and Josaphat* is conjecturally assigned (p. xxviii), on the authority of Zotenberg, to the seventh century. The chronological point has no special bearing on Spanish literature; but, on general grounds, it may be worth while to direct attention to the present Dean of Westminster's striking discovery that the *Apology* of Aristides, long regarded as lost, is interpolated in the text of *Barlaam and Josaphat* immediately after Nachor, the impostor who poses as Barlaam, appears on the scene. See Joseph Armitage Robinson, *Texts and Studies: contributions to Biblical and patristic literature* (Cambridge, 1891), vol. I, pt. 1.

The *Apology* was written during the reign of Hadrian, and yet, until 1891, no scholar had ever detected any differences between the diction of this interpolated passage and that of the rest of the text, though the latter was written—*ex hypothesi*—some five centuries later. This may not seriously invalidate Zotenberg's conclusions as to the date of composition, but it should be a warning to those who undertake to decide questions of literary chronology and attribution on stylistic grounds. The practice has been, and is, much too common among students of Spanish literature.

Samuel the Levite, Ramón Lull, Boccaccio, Lope de Vega, Calderón, and Lessing. This is followed by a critical disquisition on Pedro Alfonso's *Disciplina clericalis*, the ultimate source of Sancho Panza's story about Lope Ruiz' goats in *Don Quixote* (Part I, chap. xx)—a tale which entered vernacular literature in the *Novellino* (No. 30), and has become a universal favorite in nurseries through the version given by the Grimms in their *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* (No. 86). Like every other critic, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo is at his best when dealing with the writers whom he most esteems. Examples of this are seen in his disquisition on Abu Bakr ibn al-Tufail (the Abubacer of the Schoolmen), whose philosophical romance so strangely anticipates the idea of Gracian's *Criticón*, and in the section which deals with Ramón Lull. The latter indeed amounts to an admirable monograph on an author with whose philosophical views few modern readers are likely to be in sympathy; but, however that may be, the picturesque figure of the passionate pilgrim is placed in the true historic perspective, and delineated with uncommon force. With this should be mentioned some curious points of contact between the characters of Abu Zaid of Sarāj and Guzmán de Alfarache (a pure coincidence, for we may be tolerably sure that Mateo Alemán never heard of Hariri); a concise but exhaustive survey of the *literatura aljamiada*, so amusingly overrated by the enthusiastic Estébanez Calderón; and an appreciation of Don Juan Manuel which constitutes a capital chapter in the history of comparative literature. The sketches of the Archpriest of Talavera and of Fray Anselmo de Turmeda (a gifted sinner who deserved to be saved from the oblivion into which he had fallen), are full of life and color. The ensuing chapter on the Romances of Chivalry—which appear, like the picaresque novels, to have some early exemplars in Arabic (p. xliii)—brings us into the full current of European literature, and the consideration of it may be reserved for another chapter.

Meanwhile, it will be convenient to note a few possible addenda or suggestions. T. W. Rhys Davids' *Buddhist Birth Stories*, or *Jātaka Tales* might be consulted in connection with some traits of *Kalilah and Dimnah* mentioned on p. xvi. The reprint of Stark (Athens, 1851), and Vittorio

Puntoni's edition of the *Directorium humanæ vitæ* (Pisa, 1884)—which includes the prolegomena omitted by Stark—are worth giving on p. xvii. By a slip of the pen Raimond de Béziers' version of *Kalilah and Dimnah* is said (p. xx) to be in French instead of in Latin. On p. xxxv, the year of Pedro Alfonso's birth is stated to be 1062, and unquestionably this is the date generally accepted—probably on the authority of Labouderie, who gives it in his edition of the *Disciplina clericalis* (Paris, 1824). It may be right, but it seems quite possible that Labouderie took the date from a passage in the preface to Pedro Alfonso's *Dialogi*. The question is whether this is correctly given in the printed editions of the treatise; it reads as follows in the British Museum codex of the *Dialogi contra Judæos* (Harleian mss., 3861):—

“Hora etiam baptismatis preter ea que premissa sunt credidi beatos apostolos. et sanctam ecclesiam catholicam. Hoc autem factum est anno a natiuitate domini Mmo. Cmo. VIsexto. era Mma. Cma. XLma. IIIIta. mense iulio. die natalis apostolorum petri et pauli.”

As it stands this means that Pedro Alfonso was baptized in 1106, or 1144 of the Spanish Era. In the printed editions, however, “era M^{ma}. C^{ma}.” is transformed into “ætatis mæse anno”; it might be possible to decide the point by collating other manuscripts of the *Dialogi*.

On p. xxxv, a place might be found for *La Estoria del rey Anemar e de Iosaphat e de Barlaam*, edited by F. Lauchert in vol. vii of *Romanische Forschungen*. Burton's version of the *Arabian Nights* (p. lix) appears to be little more than a brutal plagiarism from John Payne, whose translation is overlooked. Too much importance is, I think, given to King Sancho's *Castigos* (pp. xliii and lxxi): it is impossible to avoid an uneasy suspicion that, as in the case of Alfonso the Learned, Sancho has very little responsibility for some of the writings to which his name is attached. The origin of the mistake concerning the *Libro del Oso* (p. civ) has been explained by Mr. G. Tyler Northup in *Modern Language Notes*, vol. xx, p. 30. The omission of the edition of the *Corvacho*, alleged by Panzer to have been printed at Seville in 1495, is probably justified (p. cxii); Salvá is doubtful as to the existence of the edition which, according to Ménendez and Gallardo, was published at Toledo in 1499 by Pedro Hagenbach.

However, this is an unimportant matter. But the highest compliment one can pay Señor Menéndez y Pelayo is to scrutinize his work with microscopic eyes: he is to be judged by no ordinary standard.

II.

In his fourth chapter, which is of wide and exceptional interest, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo indicates the antecedents of the romances of chivalry, beginning with the *Chanson de Roland* and Turpin's false chronicle. With a fine adroitness he threads his way through a labyrinth of perplexing details, and brings Spain into literary relation with the rest of Western Europe. Collateral questions are exhaustively discussed, and many an obscure point is made clear. It may be remarked in passing that, though Gaston Paris did at one time, as the author notes (p. cxxix), believe the first five chapters of Turpin's false chronicle to be the work of a Spanish monk attached to the monastery at Santiago de Compostela, he modified his opinion nineteen years later; his review of the third edition of Dozy's *Recherches in Romanie* (vol. xi, pp. 419–426) records conclusions very similar to those arrived at by Señor Menéndez y Pelayo. The writer pleads ingeniously in support of his favorite thesis that the assonant prose of the Maynete legend in the *Crónica general* points to the existence of a Spanish poem independent of the French. The argument may not be convincing, and, in fact, it is admitted (p. cxxxv) that there are considerable difficulties in the way of accepting it; but the hypothesis is ably presented, and is worth bearing in mind. The components of *La Gran Conquista de Ultramar* are duly examined, and the relation between *Doon de la Roche* and the *Historia de Enrrique fi de Oliva, rey de Iherusalem, Emperador de Constantinopla* is clearly defined (pp. cxxxvii–cxxxviii). No doubt Wolf's analysis of the latter book in *Ueber die neuesten Leistungen der Franzosen* is less valuable now that it was before Gayangos reprinted the Spanish text; but almost everything from Wolf's pen repays perusal, and this analysis should be mentioned in a note together with the informing study *Ueber die Oliva-Sage* in the Viennese Academy's *Denkschriften* (vol. vii, pp. 263–268). The legends of the Charlemagne cycle, which come next in order,

are no less interesting to students of English than to students of Spanish literature. The prose *Fierabras le geant*, translated into English by Caxton in 1485 and into Spanish forty years later under the title of *Historia de Carlo Magno y de los doce Pares*, was utilized by Calderón in *La Puente Mantible*, just as Lope de Vega utilized *I Reali di Francia* in *La Mocedad de Roldan*. These and other derivatives from the French, as well as the prolific Italian developments, are treated in the masterly pages leading up to the off-shoots of the *Roman de Troie*, of the Apollonius story, of *Partonopeus de Blois*, of *Floire et Blancheflor*, and of *Amis et Amiles*. P. cliii conveys to me the rare sensation of discovering that I have chanced to read the forty-five chapters of a Spanish book—the *Historia del rey Canamor y del infante Turian su fijo*—which has escaped the author (whose loss, in this matter, is to be envied rather than regretted). By a slow but most skillfully contrived transition, the writer passes to the diffusion of the Breton legends in the Peninsula, and in his fifth chapter attacks the formidable problem of *Amadis* and its origins.

Every page of this discussion deserves to be read with the closest attention, and, long as it is, one wishes it were longer. Everything connected with *Amadis de Gaula* is obscure and perplexing; after a minute examination (pp. cc–ccxxi) of the evidence brought forward to support the conflicting claims of Spain and Portugal, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo formulates eight provisional conclusions at which he has arrived. It may be convenient to state these conclusions in a condensed form, and to denote points of agreement, doubt, and dissent.

1. *Amadis* is a very free imitation of the Breton prose romances, chiefly of *Tristan* and *Lancelot*.

There will probably be no great difference of opinion on this point: I understand that the indebtedness of *Amadis* in this respect will be made clear in a study now passing through the press.

2. *Amadis* existed before 1325, the year in which Alfonso IV ascended the throne of Portugal. This monarch suggested an alteration in the Briolanja episode, and the fact that a change was made implies the existence of an earlier text which may be referred conjecturally to the time of Alfonso III, or Alfonso the Learned.

It may be objected that the identification of the Infante Alfonso is uncertain. On p. ccxi, Señor Menéndez y Pelayo writes:—

“El infante de quien se trata no puede ser otro (y en esto conviene todo el mundo) que don Alfonso IV, hijo primogénito del rey D. Dionis á quien sucedió en el trono en 1325, y que desde 1297 tuvo casa y corte separada de la de su padre.”

The phrase “en esto conviene todo el mundo,” is perhaps too sweeping. Madame Michaëlis de Vasconcellos in the *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (II Band, 2 Abteilung, p. 222) seems equally positive that the Alfonso in question was the son of Alfonso III, and brother of King Diniz. This would throw the date back to before 1312, and possibly earlier than 1304. It is safer to suspend judgment concerning these identifications, and the deductions drawn from them.

3. The author of the text put together during the reign of King Diniz was possibly—even probably—João de Lobeira who flourished between 1258–1286, and wrote the two fragments of a poem which reappears as Leonoreta’s song in *Amadis* (Book II, chapter 11).

This is extremely plausible. Yet perhaps Professor Baist’s suggestion—that the song is a late interpolation in Montalvo’s text—deserves more consideration than it receives on p. ccxiv. It is only fair to observe that, though Señor Menéndez y Pelayo combats this theory, he does not absolutely reject it.

4. In default of data, we cannot say positively in what language the original *Amadis* was written. But, as Montalvo speaks of having “corrected” (not *translated*) the first three books, the probability is that there were several versions of the text in Portuguese and Spanish.

No doubt there were—in Montalvo’s time. But two capital questions are left undecided. Did the Peninsular *Amadis* derive from a French original, and, if so, was it first translated or adopted by a Spaniard, or by a Portuguese? I am inclined to think that, though Herberay’s statement may be inaccurate, there is more foundation for it than Señor Menéndez y Pelayo is disposed to allow (p. ccxvi). The existence of a lost French original appears intrinsically probable, and, if it did exist, it is just as likely to have been translated or adapted by a Spaniard as by a Portuguese.

5. *Amadís* was known in Castille from the time of López de Ayala and Ferrús : this text consisted of three books only.

This, I think, may be admitted without any reserve.

6. The assertion of Gomes Eannes de Azurara that *Amadís* was written by Vasco de Lobeira in the reign of King Fernando of Portugal deserves no credence.

Clearly not. Fernando died in 1383 : Vasco de Lobeira was knighted in 1385. The inference that he wrote *Amadís* in his boyhood is absurd in the face of it.

7. The report of a manuscript *Amadís* in Portuguese, existing in the Aveiro archives, is vague and unsatisfactory.

It certainly is. But, even if it were correct, it would throw little light on the main point. The same may be said of the Portuguese *Amadís* which is reported to have existed in the Vimiero archives. Assuming that both manuscripts ever existed, there is nothing to show their dates.

8. The only existing form of *Amadís* is Montalvo's Spanish text, the earliest known edition of which appeared in 1508. A passage in the preface proves that the book was written after 1492, for it alludes to the capture of Granada. To the three existing books of *Amadís*, Garci Ordóñez de Montalvo added a fourth, probably written by himself.

It is true that no edition of *Amadís* has as yet been found older than the Zaragoza edition of 1508, now in the British Museum. But the future may have bibliographical surprises in store. Ersch and Gruber, as well as Ebert, speak of an incunable edition,¹ and there is no reason to assume that they spoke without any warrant. For the rest, the passage in the preface is decisive only as regards the preface : the text itself may have been finished before 1492. The name of the arranger seems to be as uncertain as everything else connected with *Amadís*. In the 1508 edition it is given as Garci Rodriguez [de Montalbo]; in the

reprints of *Amadís* it appears as Garci Ordóñez ; and, in some editions of the *Sergas de Esplandián*, the writer is called Garci Gutierrez.

Admirable as is Señor Menéndez y Pelayo's presentation of the case, a few minor details suggest comment. Is it strictly accurate to describe Macandón (p. cciii.) as page to King Lisuarte ? Was he not rather a stranger who, when advanced in years, found his way to Lisuarte's court ? It seems doubtful if the episode in which he is concerned should be dismissed as insignificant (p. cciii.), for it constitutes the crucial test of the love of *Amadís* and Oriana. The inference that Montalvo used at least three *antiguos originales* for the Briolanja incident (p. ccix.) may be correct ; but it might be argued that the third text was Montalvo's own arrangement. By a simple oversight Brian de Monjaste is said to appear for the first time in the fourth book of *Amadís* (p. ccxxxii.) ; "don brian de monjaste, cauallero muy preciado, fijo del rey Ladasan de España" is mentioned in Book II., chapter lxiiij of the 1508 edition. But these and other similar trifles may be set right by a few penstrokes. It would be strange indeed if there were no slips in a work of such dimensions ; it is astonishing that they are so unimportant and so few. The temptation to follow the author in detail through the rest of this chapter, which includes an excellent discussion of the Palmerín question (now finally answered in Mr. Purser's convincing book) is considerable ; but it must be resisted, for I have already trespassed too much on the hospitality of these columns. The study of the sentimental novel in such examples as the *Siervo libre de amor* of Rodríguez de la Cámara, Fernandez de San Pedro's *Cárcel de Amor*, and the anonymous *Questión de Amor* is followed by a discussion of the historical novel as exemplified in Guevara's *Marco Aurelio*, which is incomparably the best ever written on the subject. The same may be said of the charming essay on Montemór, which finds its place in the eighth (and, for the present, the last) chapter ; the school of prose pastorals, from Sannazaro and Bernardim Ribeiro to Gálvez Montalvo, is reviewed with a fulness of knowledge and a warm appreciation which will be admired even by those who cannot approach the one nor share the other.

I have marked a few corrigenda and omissions.

¹*Allgemeine Encyclopädie . . .* herausgegeben von J. S. Ersch und J. G. Gruber (Leipzig, 1819), vol. III, p. 298 ; Maximilian Pfeiffer, *Amadisstudien: Inaugural Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der hohen philosophischen Fakultät der Friedrich-Alexanders-Universität, Erlangen* (Mainz, 1905), p. 2, note 1.

On page cxxxv, note, for "tomo xvi" read "tomo xvii, pp. 513-541, tomo xix, pp. 562-591, y tomo xxii, pp. 345-363." Joly would refer Benoit de Sainte-More's *Roman de Troie* to 1184 rather than to 1160 (p. cxlv). Guido delle Colonne appears to have compiled the *Historia Trojana* at the suggestion of Mateo della Porta who died in 1272; it may therefore be presumed that he began the work somewhat before this date (p. cxlv). The relation of the *Conde Partinuples* to the Icelandic *Partalopa Saga* and the Danish *Persenober* is shown by Eugen Kölbing in *Die verschiedenen Gestaltungen der Partonopeus-Sage* (*Germanistische Studien*, vol. II, pp. 55-114 and 312-316): a reference to it might be useful on p. cxlviii. Robert Kaltenbacher in *Der altfranzösische Roman, Paris et Vienne* (Erlangen, 1904) reprints the Catalan text of 1495 and the Spanish text of 1524; the story was translated by Caxton in 1485 (p. clii). An early version of the Swan-children legend in *Dolopathos* deserves mention on p. clvi. The Lansdowne ms. 362 in the British Museum proves that *Florence de Rome* was current in England during the thirteenth century. The serviceable list of books recommended on p. clx should be completed by the addition of Professor Rhys' *Hibbert Lectures* and *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*, Professor Anwyl's contributions to the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, and Mr. Alfred Nutt's remarkable essays in Professor Kuno Meyer's edition of *The Voyage of Bran, Son of Febal, to the Land of the Living*. On p. clxvi others besides readers of English will look for a reference to Mr. Nutt's indispensable *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*. *Tristán de Leonís*, as stated on p. clxxxiv, has been ascribed to Philippe Camus (to whose publications Mr. Foulché-Delbosc refers in the *Revue hispanique*, vol. XI, pp. 587-595); the Spanish *Tristán de Leonís* derives apparently from the French of Luc, Seigneur du Château de Gast. As an illustration of the rapid diffusion of *Amadis* in Italy (p. ccxxxix), a sentence from a letter written by Bembo to Ramusio on February 4, 1512, is worth quoting:—"Ben si pare che il Valerio sia sepolto in quel suo Amadigi" (Vittorio Cian, *Decennio della vita del Bembo*, p. 206). The vogue of the book in France is shown by M. E. Bourciez in *Les mœurs polies et la littérature*

de cour sous Henri II. Señor Menéndez y Pelayo's work was probably already in print before Maximilian Pfeiffer's *Amadisstudien* (Mainz, 1905) was available; otherwise it would have been included on p. dxxvi, for it contains one or two bibliographical details usually overlooked. It is doubtful, to say the least, whether the first two parts of *Palmerin de Inglaterra* were translated into English before 1596 (p. cclxxv): Mr. Purser, indeed (*op. cit.* p. 391) is not altogether satisfied that they were printed before 1609. Lastly, on p. cdlsxvii, "Wilcox" should be "Wilson."

Possibly some of these suggestions may be utilized in the second edition which is certain to be forthcoming before long. Meanwhile, all students of Spanish literature will rejoice in the possession of a book which is at once a monument of learning and a masterpiece of artistic exposition.

JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY.

London.

Histoire de la Mise en scène dans le Théâtre religieux français du Moyen-Âge, par GUSTAVE COHEN. Paris, Honoré Champion, 1906. 8°, 304 pp.

The present work is a prize essay printed by the Belgian Academy, who are responsible for the choice of its subject. In this instance, they aimed less at favoring original research than at obtaining a consistent and systematic survey of the somewhat scattered results of the latest investigations. In this Mr. G. Cohen has fully succeeded, and reference to his essay will palpably lighten the labors of future students of the mediæval drama by providing them at once with the necessary facts and authorities. The author may thus pride himself on having made a valuable addition to the extant literature on the subject.

As its title implies, his work deals less with the texts themselves than with the rubrics settling the details of stage management and stage business, and with documents of every description throwing light on the external history of the mystery plays. It is divided into three books: I. *La mise en scène dans le drame liturgique*, describing the chanting of sequences and scenes in connection with services inside the church. II. *La mise en scène dans le*